



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

if it be understood to possess only the precarious authority depending on the favor of men!" This sentence, uttered in criticism of Catholic authority-religion, is equally applicable to Protestant authority-religion.

Whatever may be thought of Sabatier's constructive programme, he has at least made one thing clear. An authority-religion is fatally exposed to the verdict of historical criticism. The religion of the Spirit is released from all fear of historical criticism. But the problem still remains: What is the true relation of this religion to the Bible and to the historic creeds of Christendom? This question must be answered before an intelligent use of the Bible is possible in Protestant churches which regard themselves as exponents of the religion of the Spirit. It is to be regretted that Sabatier could not have given a clearer answer to this question; though, as has been suggested above, the answer must come by way of a profound insight into the psychology of religious convictions, rather than by way of establishing an external program. Thus, after all, Sabatier has here also shown the right method approach to the problem.

G. B. S.

A Short Introduction to the Gospels. By E. D. BURTON. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1904. Pp. 144. \$1.

Studies in the Gospel according to Mark. By E. D. BURTON. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1904. Pp. xx+250. \$1.

Introduction more than commentary is now the need of the average Bible student. This *Short Introduction to the Gospels*, including a chapter on the synoptic problem, has a definite aim, and without superfluous words goes straight to its mark. It uses chiefly internal evidence, and asks each gospel to disclose its own secret.

The chapter on "The Gospel according to Matthew," closing with a table of contents which exhibits excellently its general plan, will be welcome to all students of that difficult New Testament book. One must, however, work out in detail the lines of evidence indicated, in order to appreciate the significance of more than one conclusion to which they lead. For instance: "the writer has wrought out all his material into a real book, with a definite course of thought and a clearly defined aim." "Though so different in form, it reminds us by its purpose of the epistle to the Hebrews." "There is much to suggest that our evangelist wrote not indeed for the same persons, but for those who were exposed to a similar danger." Finally, "it carries the doctrine of the apostle Paul to the conclusion which Paul

saw to be involved in it, but to which he was not wont himself to press it." Dr. Burton's remark in a later chapter concerning the authorship of the fourth gospel would also fitly apply here: "The knowledge of the author which we most need to assist us in the interpretation of the book is not his name, but his historical situation, his relation to Jesus and to the facts that he relates."

The notes appended to the chapter on Luke's gospel merit particular attention. Note II is on "The Enrolment in the Governorship of Quirinius." In view of the discoveries of Grenfell and Hunt, and the facts gathered by Ramsay, the opinion is expressed on p. 74 that "the date of the birth of Jesus must be provisionally assigned to 7 B. C." From another note (see p. 120) one derives a different impression of the author's opinion.

Dr. Burton's view of the Johannine problem will command attention. A single quotation will state it in part.

The narrative of the life and discourses of Jesus proceeds from an eye-witness of the events, a personal disciple of Jesus, in all probability John the son of Zebedee. The whole material has, however, been melted and recast in the mind of the author. Lapse of time, change of surroundings, contact with a new type of thought . . . have all operated to make the book not merely a narrative of the life of Jesus, but a series of historical sermons shaped to meet the needs of living readers. This material left the hand of the author, moreover, not in the form of the book we have, but in a number of smaller books.

This booklet theory seems to us, we confess, extremely precarious, creating quite as many difficulties as it relieves.

To expound the synoptic problem in less than twenty small pages of English is to do the impossible. No other book that the reviewer knows of does it so well as this. It is perhaps his prejudice that leads him to desiderate a more distinct statement of that which constitutes the central contention of those who advocate "the oral gospel theory." It is also a question whether the student does not need, before taking up the introduction to Matthew's gospel, a forward glance at the nature of the synoptic problem. There is need at the very outset of a distinct reminder that "the synoptic gospels resemble one another in purpose, as in scope and content, by more than they differ the one from the other" (see p. 62).

The *Studies in Mark's gospel* is a book for a different class of students, "for secondary classes." The lessons have already borne the test of actual use by experienced teachers, and all the material appears to be admirably arranged. The appended dictionary, filling twelve pages, is an important

feature. There are a few pictorial illustrations. The house on p. 23 is not a particularly well-chosen specimen of Palestinian domestic architecture, and the rock-cut tomb on p. 63 (cf. p. 218) might be replaced by another subject.

WM. ARNOLD STEVENS.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Education in Religion and Morals. By PROFESSOR GEORGE ALBERT COE. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1904. Pp. 434. \$1.35.

This is a great book—the greatest on its subject since Bushnell's *Christian Nurture* in 1847. It takes religious education off its apex of formal dogmatic instruction, where it has been perilously poised in unstable equilibrium, and sets it down on the broad, stable base of sharing the concrete experiences of life in so intimate and transparent a way that the religious principles and motives involved shall shine through, and pass by contagion from the personality of the teacher to the person taught. It gives us a point of view; and in the light of that point of view goes forth to challenge all unreality and insincerity, whether in pulpit or professor's chair, whether in Young People's Society or Young Men's Association; whether in state school or Sunday school; whether in college or university.

Yet if it suggests that the International Lessons are unpedagogical; the Y. P. S. C. E. pledge anti-educational; the Y. M. C. A. condition of membership irreligious; much Sunday-school teaching spiritually debilitating; all goody-goody Sunday-school books "corrupters, because weakeners, of character;" all precocious prayer-meeting publicity pernicious; and many other startling educational heresies, it offers them so mildly, as the unsought but inevitable logical outcome of its fundamental point of view, that even the persons criticised could hardly feel it in their hearts to complain, and would hardly note these strictures, unless they were specifically pointed out.

What, then, is this revolutionary point of view? Simply the self-evident proposition that all religious education is the "genuine mingling of a developed life in the interests and occupations of an undeveloped life." It is "life propagating itself directly and concretely." "It means having experiences and occupations in common, so that the real self of each, with its actual interests, is revealed freely to the other." "We are to make wholesome fellowships—whether in the home, the school, the church, the college, or the neighborhood—so warm, so natural, so unremitting, so unreserved, that every unwholesome fellowship shall seem artificial and